

**PATENT**  
**IBM Docket No. GB9-2000-0033**

**REMARKS**

**Status:**

Claims 1 - 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teaching of US Pat. No. 6,058,389 to Chandra et al., considered in view of the teaching of US Pat. No. 5,857,180 to Hallmark et al. Claims 1 and 13 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness.

Claims 1-17 are presented for reconsideration as explained in the discussion below.

**Analysis:**

As regards the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness, the claims have been amended to remove the reference to "rollback."

The independent claims 1,13 ,15 and 16 have been amended to more strongly emphasize the special delay in applying to the message the index key which identifies it for receiver applications. This allows the index key search to also serve to prevent (by delaying an identification) access to the message before a commit occurs. The prior art uses a separate lock approach for this purpose which adds complexity and processing time.

Applicants strongly disagree with the analysis of the Office Action at page 3, lines 1-4 which state:

*"Chandra teaches if the parameter ON\_COMMIT, then step 604 (Fig. 6) the process carries out the table insert operation (for ENQUEUE processes) (Chandra, Col. 13,*

**PATENT**  
**IBM Docket No. GB9-2000-0033**

*lines 56-59). Clearly Chandra teaches assigning an index key to a message in response to commit of the operation of putting the message on the queue."*

There is no such teaching. The "standard option" (col. 13, line 31) is for the Fig. 6 A logic branch of boxes 606, 608, 610 and 612) where there is an ENQUEUE (608) before the commit (610). There is no discussion of delaying an index key until after commit. As to the box 604 path it should be noted at col. 11 lines 51-54 it is explained that:

*"An application can specify that a specific request is a transaction in itself, thereby making its result immediately available to other transactions. For example, messages may be made visible to other applications either immediately after an enqueue or dequeue operation is completed, or only after the transaction is committed."*

Box 604 is the immediately available option (nonstandard option) and there is no commit just immediate visibility. This case is not the situation of Applicant's claims which call for a subsequent commit and delay based thereon before a message is available for visibility to applications.

Where does Chandra teach a delay in writing the index key. Without a teaching, the prior art approach of indexing as a part of the enqueue operation would be expected. That is, no delay.

The other prior art including the Hallmark teaching does not make up for this fundamental deficiency. Again, where is the teaching of a delay in applying the index key until a commit occurs? The teaching that is known is a separate lock/ unlock process which adds another layer of complexity.

**PATENT**  
**IBM Docket No. GB9-2000-0033**

As indicated above, it is believed the claims now clearly identify Applicant's advance over the prior art. A clever way of using the normal index search to serve another function and eliminate complexity. Accordingly, early notice to the effect that this case has been placed in condition for allowance is earnestly solicited.

Applicant's attorney would welcome a telephone communication from the Examiner (to the telephone number indicated below), for purposes of advancing the disposition of this case

Respectfully Submitted,

  
George E. Grosser

Reg. No. 25,629I

c/o  
IBM Corp.  
Dept. T81/Bldg. 503 PO Box 12195  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

(919)968-7847  
Fax 919-254-4330  
EMAIL: gegch@prodigy.net